

Q85

Please detail the Other issue you have not reported.

- 1 ..
- 2 Acceptance or undue consideration, by some EPA managers, of professional opinions developed by parties antagonistic to EPA which contradict informed professional views and recommendations of EPA staff.
- 3 (b) (5)
- 4 (b) (6), (b) (5)
- 5 lack of interest from managers
- 6 I don't know what HAS and HAS not been reported
- 7 Change in policy not supported by scientific conclusions in an office where I used to work.
- 8 Not allowing proper/better methodologies to be used in the order to meet new shorter timelines. New managers do not understand scientific nuances to be able to discuss the needed analyses with customers and most staff are not allowed to have those discussions with the customers directly. New chain of command. That chain of command would only work if the upper level understood the technical constraints, and they do not.
- 9 I wasn't informed whether or not the internal science approach(policy) was approved. I was assigned to the works and monitored until I finished them
- 10 The concerns I've heard about all relate to what scientists have told me in confidence. Therefore, I don't have any substantive evidence to support them. Part of the problem with the interference under the previous administration was that there was a culture of intimidation that kept people from bringing up opinions that they knew wouldn't be received by top management. The political appointees were also good about not writing anything down that would create an incriminating paper trail.
- 11 (b) (5)
- 12 it was part of an IG investigation so shared information as part of that review
- 13 Obfuscation or downplaying of conclusions Discouraging professional development
- 14 (b) (5)
- 15 Delay of reporting research findings to participants by a federal collaborating partner. (b) (5)
- 16 (b) (6), (b) (5)
- 17 Misuse of survey data collection to support bad decision making
- 18 delaying of reports, pressure to change reports, words, statements, or cancel FAC meetings
- 19 I wish to use a catchy phrase to help draw attention to a scientific product. No one but my supervisor has objected or expressed concern, but he still refuses to allow it in the title or abstract.
- 20 This had to do with a pre-determined policy decision. If the science supported it, the science would be used, if it didn't, it wouldn't.
- 21 we do not gather enough evidence or data to support our decisions, because we are not resourced to do that.
- 22 Lack of support or recognition for high impact publications.
- 23 (b) (5)
- 24 Don't rock the boat.
- 25 expedited schedule that made thorough review difficult.
- 26 Retaliation by first line supervisor.
- 27 I believe the issue is due to unqualified personnel or lack of experience at the decision making level
- 28 (b) (5)
- 29 decisions on sufficiency of data driven by statutory deadlines.
- 30 As I referenced in a previous comment, I have been concerned about legal interpretations overriding what would be the scientifically appropriate course of action.
- 31 OMB's interference, paralyzing us with ever-increasing requests for "peer review" and "interagency review" which has mostly served to shut down lines of evidence and prevent EPA from getting health-protective rules out.
- 32 Coercion
- 33 Sourcing of data from public platforms and improper analysis of this data
- 34 Ignoring of scientific advice that does not support prior administration's priorities.
- 35 (b) (6), (b) (5)
- 36 EPA political leadership
- 37 As the whole world knows, the Trump Administration suppressed information on climate change. This is not a secret.
- 38 I'd rather not; I do not trust that there wouldn't be reprisal.
- 39 Facts based on data and findings.
- 40 No detail I have not have reported no other issue in reported.
- 41 Rushing of a formal EPA decision (b) (6), (b) (5) without first consulting with all regional EPA subject matter experts
- 42 Divisional management has put unqualified personnel in decision making positions with direct impact on data quality.
- 43 (b) (5)
- 44 Removal from research and EPA teams not using the established procedures as detailed in the Charter Documents.
- 45 At the Agency level, press releases by Agency leadership that contradicted established science or recent findings. Within (b) (6) political appointees affecting scientific planning (i.e., what was studied) for what appeared to be political reasons.